arXiv:1112.3717v2 [math.AC] 20 Oct 2012

SEQUENTIALLY COHEN–MACAULAY MODULES WITH RESPECT TO AN IRRELEVANT IDEAL

AHAD RAHIMI

Abstract. For a finitely generated bigraded S-module M where S is a standard bigraded polynomial ring we define the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $\mathcal{F}$ of M with respect to the bigraded irrelevant ideal Q. We call M to be sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect Q if M admits a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. The algebraic properties of these modules are investigated. All hypersurface rings that are sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q are classified.

Introduction

In [12] Stanley introduced the notion sequentially Cohen–Macaulay for graded modules. This concept was studied by several authors. We refer to ([3], [4], [6], [11], [13]). In this paper we define this notion for bigraded modules. Some new algebraic invariants make sense to study in this case. We let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ be the standard bigraded polynomial ring over a field K, $P = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $Q = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ the bigraded irrelevant ideals of S and M a finitely generated bigraded S-module. In [9] we call M to be relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$ where $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$ denotes the cohomological dimension of M with respect to Q. We define a finite filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ of M by bigraded submodules M a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q if

(a) Each quotient M_i/M_{i-1} is relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q;
(b) $0 \leq \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_1/M_0) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_2/M_1) < \cdots < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_r/M_{r-1})$.

We call M to be sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if M admits a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. Sequentially Cohen–Macaulay introduced by Stanley results from our definition if we assume $P = 0$. The paper is organized as follows:

In the preliminary section, we show that "a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q is unique". Also for a Cohen–Macaulay filtration $\mathcal{F}$ of M with respect to Q we observe that $H_Q^{q_i}(M) \cong H_Q^{q_i}(M_i) \cong H_Q^{q_i}(M_i/M_{i-1})$ where $q_i = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $H_Q^k(M) = 0$ for $k \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$. This observation is used to derive some basic algebraic properties of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules with respect to Q in the next section. For instance, we improve [9, Proposition 2.3] as follows: Consider the graded components of $H_Q^k(M)$ as a finitely generated graded $K[x]$-module where $K[x] = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. If M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, then the Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity of $H_Q^k(M)_j$ is bounded

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W50, 13C14, 13D45, 16W70. The author was in part supported by a grant from IPM (No. 900130058).

for all k. In Section 2 we also show that if M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) > 0$ and $|K| = \infty$, then there exists a bihomogeneous M-regular element $y \in Q$ of degree $(0, 1)$ such that M/yM is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, too. We give an example to show that the converse does not hold.

In Section 3 we consider $L \otimes_K N$ as S-module where L and N are two non-zero finitely generated graded modules over $K[x]$ and $K[y]$, respectively. We obtain a characterization for sequentially Cohen–Macaulayness $L \otimes_K N$ with respect to Q as follows: $L \otimes_K N$ is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if and only if N is Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module. We also discuss two questions on the sequentially Cohen–Macaulayness of M with respect to P, Q, and $P + Q$ in general.

In the last section, we let $f \in S$ be a bihomogeneous element of degree (a, b) and consider the hypersurface ring $R = S/fS$. Notice that if $a, b > 0$, we have $\operatorname{grade}(Q, R) = n - 1$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = n$. Hence R is not relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus it is natural to ask whether R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. We classify all hypersurface rings that are sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q as follows: Let R be the hypersurface ring. Then R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if and only if $f = h_1h_2$ where $\deg(h_1) = (a, 0)$ with $a \geq 0$ and $\deg(h_2) = (0, b)$ with $b \geq 0$.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Let K be a field and $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ be the standard bigraded polynomial ring over. In other words, $\deg x_i = (1, 0)$ and $\deg y_j = (0, 1)$ for all i and j. We set the bigraded irrelevant ideals $P = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $Q = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)$. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. We denote by $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$ the *cohomological dimension of M with respect to Q* which is the largest integer i for which $H^i_Q(M) \neq 0$. Notice that $0 \leq \operatorname{cd}(Q, M) \leq n$. We recall the following [9, Definition 1.3]

Definition 1.1. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module and $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. We call M to be *relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q* if $H^i_Q(M) = 0$ for all $i \neq q$. For simplicity, from now on we say "M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q" instead of "M is relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q".

Remark 1.2. By [9, [Proposition 1.2] M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if and only if $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q$. This is also equivalent to saying that $M_k = M_{(k,*)} = \oplus_j M_{(k,j)}$ is finitely generated Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module of dimension q for all k. We recall the following facts from [9] which will be used in the sequel.

$$\operatorname{cd}(P, M) = \dim M/QM \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \dim M/PM. \tag{1}$$

If M is Cohen–Macaulay, then

$$\operatorname{grade}(P, M) + \operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \dim M, \tag{2}$$

see, Formula (5) in [9]. If M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $K = \infty$, then

$$\operatorname{cd}(P, M) + \operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \dim M, \tag{3}$$

see, [9, Theorem, 3.6]. We also recall the following facts from [2]. If $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ is an exact sequence of S-modules with M finitely generated, then

$$\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \max\{\operatorname{cd}(Q, M'), \operatorname{cd}(Q, M'')\}, \tag{4}$$

see [2, Proposition 4.4]. If M is a finitely generated S-module, then

$$\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \max\{\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) : \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M)\}, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \max\{\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) : \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(M)\}, \tag{6}$$

see, [2, Corollary 4.6].

Definition 1.3. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. We call a finite filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ of M by bigraded submodules M a *Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q* if

(a) Each quotient M_i/M_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q;
(b) $0 \leq \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_1/M_0) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_2/M_1) < \cdots < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_r/M_{r-1})$.

A Cohen–Macaulay filtration introduced by Stanley is in our terminology a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = P + Q$.

Definition 1.4. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. We call M to be *sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q* if M admits a Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q.

We observe that ordinary sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules are special cases of our definition. In fact, if we assume $P = 0$. Then $m = 0$, and $Q = \mathfrak{m}$ is the unique graded maximal ideal of S with $\deg y_i = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(\mathfrak{m}, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \dim M_i/M_{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

Example 1.5. Cohen–Macaulay modules with respect to Q are the obvious examples of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.

Example 1.6. If M is finitely generated bigraded S-module for which $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) \leq 1$, then M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. In fact, we may assume that M is not Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = 0$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = 1$. The filtration $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq M_2 = M$ where $M_1 = H^0_Q(M)$ is a Cohen-Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. Notice that, if $n = 1$ in the polynomial ring S, then any bigraded S-module is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.

Proposition 1.7. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module that is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ with respect to Q. Then we have $H^{q_i}_Q(M) \cong H^{q_i}_Q(M_i) \cong H^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})$ where $q_i = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $H^k_Q(M) = 0$ for $k \notin \{q_1, \ldots, q_r\}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the length r of the filtration of M. Let $r = 1$ and consider the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 = M$. As $M_1 = M$ is relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, the assertion is clear in this case. The assertion is also clear for $r = 2$ by considering the exact sequence $0 \to M_1 \to M_2 \to M_2/M_1 \to 0$ and the fact that M_1 is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Now suppose $r \geq 3$ and the statement holds for sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules with respect to Q with filtrations of length less than r. We want to prove it for M which is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q and has the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ with respect to Q of length r. Notice that M_{r-1} which appears in the filtration $\mathcal{F}$ of M is also sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus by the induction hypothesis we have $H_Q^{q_i}(M_{r-1}) \cong H_Q^{q_i}(M_i) \cong H_Q^{q_i}(M_i/M_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r-1$ and $H_Q^k(M_{r-1}) = 0$ for $k \notin \{q_1, \ldots, q_{r-1}\}$. Now the exact sequence $0 \to M_{r-1} \to M \to M/M_{r-1} \to 0$ yields $H_Q^{q_r}(M) \cong H_Q^{q_r}(M_r/M_{r-1})$ and $H_Q^t(M) \cong H_Q^t(M_{r-1})$ for $0 \leq t < q_r$. Therefore, the desired result follows. $\square$

In the proof of Proposition 1.7 one obtains the following observations

Corollary 1.8. *With the assumptions and the notation of Proposition 1.7 we have*

(a) $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1})$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, r$ *and hence*
$\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_1) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_2) < \cdots < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_r) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$.
(b) $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M_i) = q_1$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, r$.
(c) $M_1 = H_Q^0(M)$ *if and only if* $q_1 = 0$.

Parts (a) and (b) say that $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = q_1$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q_r$.

Next, we show that the filtration $\mathcal{F}$ given in Definition 1.3 is unique. To answer this question we need some preparation. We let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module and, $\sum$ be the set of all bigraded submodules N of M such that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$. As M is a Noetherian S-module, $\sum$ has a maximal element with respect to inclusion, say N. Let L be an arbitrary element in $\sum$. By using (4) it follows that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, L+N) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$ and hence the maximality N yields $L \subseteq N$. Thus our discussion so far shows

Lemma 1.9. *There is a unique largest bigraded submodule* N *of* M *for which* $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$.

Now we can make the following definition:

Definition 1.10. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. We call a filtration $\mathcal{G}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ of bigraded submodules of M the *dimension filtration of* M *with respect to* Q if M_{i-1} is the largest submodule of M_i for which $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_{i-1}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$.

A dimension filtration introduced by Schenzel [11] is a dimension filtration with respect to the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = P + Q$. The filtration $\mathcal{G}$ given in Definition 1.10 is unique. In order to prove the uniqueness $\mathcal{F}$ given in Definition 1.3, we will show that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$.

In [7] M is called to be *relatively unmixed* with respect to Q if $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p})$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M)$.

Lemma 1.11. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module and N a non-zero bigraded submodule of M. If M is relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, then* $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$.

Proof. Since M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows from [7, Corollary 1.11] that M is relatively unmixed with respect to Q and hence $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p})$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M)$. As N is a non-zero submodule of M we have $\operatorname{Ass}(N) \neq \emptyset$ and $\operatorname{Ass}(N) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(M)$. Thus by using (5) we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N) = \max\{\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) : \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(N)\} = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$, as desired. □

By an argument similar to [3, Lemma 4.4] we have the following

Proposition 1.12. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration of M with respect to Q given in Definition 1.3 and $\mathcal{G}$ be the dimension filtration of M with respect to Q given in Definition 1.10. Then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ and $\mathcal{G}$: $0 = N_0 \subsetneq N_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq N_s = M$. We will show that $r = s$ and $M_i = N_i$ for all i. By Corollary 1.8(a) we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_{i-1}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, r$. Hence, Definition 1.10 says that $M_{r-1} \subseteq N_{s-1}$. Assume $M_{r-1} \subsetneq N_{s-1}$. Thus N_{s-1}/M_{r-1} is a non-zero submodule of M/M_{r-1}. Since M/M_{r-1} is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows from Lemma 1.11 that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N_{s-1}/M_{r-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M/M_{r-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$. The second equality follows from Corollary 1.8(a). Now by using (4) the exact sequence $0 \to M_{r-1} \to N_{s-1} \to N_{s-1}/M_{r-1} \to 0$ yields $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N_{s-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$, a contradiction. Thus $M_{r-1} = N_{s-1}$. Continuing in this way, we get $r = s$ and $M_i = N_i$ for all i. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$. □

2. Some algebraic properties of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules with respect to Q

In this section, we discuss some algebraic properties of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules with respect to Q. We begin with the following

Lemma 2.1. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module that is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. If M is relatively unmixed with respect to Q, then M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. In particular, unmixed sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules are Cohen–Macaulay.*

Proof. Let $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. By Corollary 1.8 we have $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = \operatorname{grade}(Q, M_1)$. Since M_1 is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows from [7, Corollary 1.11] that M_1 is relatively unmixed with respect to Q. Thus $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = \operatorname{grade}(Q, M_1) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_1) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p})$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_1)$. As M is relatively unmixed with respect to Q and $\operatorname{Ass}(M_1) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(M)$, we have $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$, as desired. □

As first property of sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules we have the following

Proposition 2.2. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module with* $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) > 0$ *and $|K| = \infty$. If M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, then there* *exists a bihomogeneous M-regular element $y \in Q$ of degree $(0,1)$ such that M/yM is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.*

Proof. We assume that M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q and let $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. Since $\operatorname{grade}(Q,M) = \operatorname{grade}(Q,M_1) = \operatorname{cd}(Q,M_1) > 0$, it follows from that $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) > 0$ for all i. We set $N_i = M_i/M_{i-1}$. Thus by [9, Corollary, 3.5] which also valid for finitely many modules which are Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q and have positive cohomological dimension with respect to Q, there exists a bihomogeneous element $y \in Q$ of degree $(0,1)$ such that y is N_i-regular for all i and $\overline{N_i}$ is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q,\overline{N_i}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q,N_i) - 1$. Here $\overline{L} = L/yL$ for any S-module L.

Consider the exact sequence $0 \to M_{i-1} \to M_i \to N_i \to 0$ for all i. Since y is regular on N_i for all i, it follows that $\operatorname{Tor}_1^S(S/yS, N_i) = 0$ for all i. Hence, we get the following exact sequence $0 \to \overline{M_{i-1}} \to \overline{M_i} \to \overline{N_i} \to 0$ for all i. Now the filtration $\mathcal{G}$: $0 = \overline{M_0} \subsetneq \overline{M_1} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \overline{M_r} = M/yM$ is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration for M/yM with respect to Q. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{grade}(Q, \overline{M_i}/\overline{M_{i-1}}) &= \operatorname{grade}(Q,\overline{N_i}) \\
&= \operatorname{grade}(Q,N_i) - 1 \\
&= \operatorname{cd}(Q,N_i) - 1 \\
&= \operatorname{cd}(Q,\overline{N_i}) \\
&= \operatorname{cd}(Q,\overline{M_i}/\overline{M_{i-1}}),
\end{aligned}$$

and, since $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_{i+1}/M_i)$ for all i, it follows that $\operatorname{cd}(Q,\overline{M_i}/\overline{M_{i-1}}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q,\overline{M_{i+1}}/\overline{M_i})$ for all i. □

The following example shows that the converse of the above proposition does not hold:

Example 2.3. Consider the hypersurface ring $R = K[x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2]/(f)$ where $f = x_1y_1 + x_2y_2$. One has $\operatorname{grade}(Q,R) = 1$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q,R) = 2$. By [9, Lemma 3.4] there exists a bihomogeneous R-regular element $y \in Q$ of degree $(0,1)$ such that $\operatorname{cd}(Q,R/yR) = \operatorname{cd}(Q,R) - 1 = 1$ and of course $\operatorname{grade}(Q,R/yR) = \operatorname{grade}(Q,R) - 1 = 0$. So R/yR is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. On the other hand R is not sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Indeed, $\operatorname{Ass}(R) = \{(f)\}$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q,R) = \operatorname{cd}(Q,S/(f))$ says that R is relatively unmixed with respect to Q. If R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, then by Lemma 2.1, R is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, a contradiction.

Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. The finiteness dimension of M with respect to Q is defined by

$$f_Q(M) = \inf\{i \in \mathbb{N} : H_Q^i(M) \text{ is not finitely generated }\}.$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let the notation be as in Proposition 1.7. Suppose that $f_Q(M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q,M)$. Then M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{grade}(Q,M) > 0$ if and only if M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.*

Proof. Let M be sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Since $f_Q(M) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$ with $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M) > 0$, it follows from Proposition 1.7 that $H^k_Q(M) = 0$ for $k < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M)$. Hence M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. The converse is trivial. $\square$

Let R be a Noetherian ring, I an ideal R and N an R-module. The module N is said to be *I-cofinite* if $\operatorname{Supp}(N) \subseteq V(I)$ and $\operatorname{Ext}^i_R(R/I, N)$ is finitely generated for all i.

Proposition 2.5. *Let the assumptions and the notation be as in Proposition 1.7. Then $H^k_Q(M)$ is not finitely generated for all $k \in \{q_1, \ldots, q_r\}$ with $q_1 > 0$ while $H^k_Q(M)$ is Q-cofinite for all k.*

Proof. The first statement is known. We will show that $H^k_Q(M)$ is Q-cofinite for all k. The claim is clear if $k \notin \{q_1, \ldots, q_r\}$ by Proposition 1.7. We first note that $\operatorname{Supp}(H^{q_i}_Q(M)) \subseteq V(Q)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. For a fix i, we consider the Grothendieck spectral sequence

$$\operatorname{Ext}^s_S(S/Q, H^t_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})) \underset{s}{\Longrightarrow} \operatorname{Ext}^{s+t}_S(S/Q, M_i/M_{i-1}).$$

As $H^t_Q(M_i/M_{i-1}) = 0$ for $t \neq q_i$, by using Proposition 1.7 we get the following isomorphism

$$\operatorname{Ext}^s_S(S/Q, H^{q_i}_Q(M)) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^s_S(S/Q, H^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^{s+q_i}_S(S/Q, M_i/M_{i-1})$$

which shows that $\operatorname{Ext}^s_S(S/Q, H^{q_i}_Q(M))$ is finitely generated. Thus $H^{q_i}_Q(M)$ is Q-cofinite for all i. Therefore, $H^k_Q(M)$ is Q-cofinite for all k. $\square$

In [7] we have shown that if M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q$, then $\dim_S H^q_Q(M) = \dim M - q$ and $\dim_{K[x]} H^q_Q(M)_j = \dim M - q$ for $j \ll 0$ with $q > 0$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $|K| = \infty$. With the assumptions and the notation of Proposition 1.7 we have*

(a) $\dim H^{q_i}_Q(M) = \dim M_i/M_{i-1} - q_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, r$.
(b) $\dim H^{q_i}_Q(M)_j = \dim M_i/M_{i-1} - q_i$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, r$, $j \ll 0$ *with* $q_1 > 0$.

Proof. The assertion follows from Proposition 1.7, [7, Proposition 2.1] and [7, Corollary 2.4]. $\square$

Let R be a graded ring. Recall that a graded R-module N is *tame* if there exists an integer j_0 such that $N_j = 0$ for all $j \leq j_0$, or else $N_j \neq 0$ for all $j \leq j_0$.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $|K| = \infty$. With the assumptions and the notation of Proposition 1.7 we have $H^k_Q(M)$ is tame for all k.*

Proof. The claim is obvious if $k \notin \{q_1, \ldots, q_r\}$ by Proposition 1.7. If $q_1 = 0$, then we have $H^0_Q(M)_j = 0$ for $j \ll 0$ and if $q_1 > 0$, the assertion follows from Proposition 2.6. $\square$

Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module and set $K[x] = K[x_1, \dots, x_m]$. Then the local cohomology modules $H^i_Q(M)$ are naturally bigraded S-modules and each graded component $H^i_Q(M)_j = H^i_Q(M)_{(*,j)} = \bigoplus_k H^i_Q(M)_{(k,j)}$ is finitely generated graded $K[x]$-module with grading $\big(H^i_Q(M)_j\big)_k = H^i_Q(M)_{(k,j)}$. Let N be a finitely generated graded $K[x]$-module with graded minimal free resolution

$$\mathbb{F} : 0 \to F_k \longrightarrow F_{k-1} \to \cdots \to F_1 \longrightarrow F_0 \to 0.$$

The Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity of N is the invariant

$$\operatorname{reg}(N) = \max\{b_i(\mathbb{F}) - i : i \geq 0\}$$

where $b_i(\mathbb{F})$ denotes the maximal degree of the generators of F_i. In [9, Proposision 2.3] we have shown that if M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q$, then the function $f_{q,M}(j) = \operatorname{reg} H^q_Q(M)_j$ is bounded. For more results in this regard see [8]. In the following we improve [9, Proposision 2.3] as follows:

Corollary 2.8. *Let the assumptions and the notation be as in Proposition 1.7. Then for all k the functions $f_{k,M}(j) = \operatorname{reg} H^k_Q(M)_j$ are bounded.*

Proof. The claim is clear if $k \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$ by Proposition 1.7. Since M_i/M_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q for $i = 1, \dots, r$, it follows from [9, Proposision 2.3] that the functions $f_{q_i,Mi/M_{i-1}}(j) = \operatorname{reg} H^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})_j$ are bounded for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Thus, $f_{q_i,M}(j) = \operatorname{reg} H^{q_i}_Q(M)_j$ are bounded for $i = 1, \dots, r$ by Proposition 1.7. Therefore, $f_{k,M}(j) = \operatorname{reg} H^k_Q(M)_j$ are bounded for all k. $\square$

For a bigraded S-module M, we recall that the ith a-invariant of M is defined by

$$a^i_Q(M) = \sup\{\mu : H^i_Q(M)_{(*,\mu)} \neq 0\},$$

and so $\operatorname{reg}(M) = \max_i\{a^i_Q(M) + i : i \geq 0\}$.

Corollary 2.9. *With the assumptions and the notation of Proposition 1.7 we have*

$$\operatorname{reg}(M) = \max\{a^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1}) + q_i : i = 1, \dots, r\}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 1.7 we have $a^{q_i}_Q(M) = a^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $a^i_Q(M) = -\infty$ for $i \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$. Thus the result follows. $\square$

3. SEQUENTIALLY COHEN–MACAULAYNESS WITH RESPECT TO P, Q AND $P + Q$

In this section we discuss the relationship of sequentially Cohen–Macaulayness of M with respect to P, Q and $P + Q$. First we have the following characterization of sequentially Cohen–Macaulayness of $L \otimes_K N$ as S-module where L and N are two non-zero finitely generated graded modules over $K[x]$ and $K[y]$, respectively. For the bigraded S-module M we define the bigraded Matlis-dual of M to be $M^\vee$ where the (i, j)th bigraded components of $M^\vee$ is given by $\operatorname{Hom}_K(M_{(i,j)}, K)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module. If M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q$, then $\big(H^q_Q(M)^\vee\big)_{(k,*)}$ is finitely generated Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module of dimension q for all k.*

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(H^q_Q(M)^\vee\right)_{(k,*)} &\cong \left(H^q_Q(M)_{(-k,*)}\right)^\vee\\ &\cong \left(H^q_{(y_1,\dots,y_n)}(M_{(-k,*)})\right)^\vee\\ &\cong \operatorname{Ext}^{n-q}_{K[y]}(M_{(-k,*)}, S(-n)).\end{aligned}$$

Since M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M) = q$, it follows from [9, Proposition 1.2] that $M_{(-k,*)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module of dimension q. Therefore the conclusion follows. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Let L and N be two non-zero finitely generated graded modules over $K[x]$ and $K[y]$, respectively. We set $M = L \otimes_K N$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) *M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay S-module with respect to Q;*
(b) *N is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module.*

Proof. $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$: Let $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q . By Proposition 1.7 we have

$$H^{q_i}_Q(M) \cong H^{q_i}_Q(M_i) \cong H^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})$$

where $q_i = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ and $H^k_Q(M) = 0$ for $k \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$. Note that $H^{q_i}_Q(M) \cong L \otimes_K H^{q_i}_Q(N)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, see the proof of [9, Proposition 1.5]. Hence $H^{q_i}_Q(M)^\vee \cong L^\vee \otimes_K H^{q_i}_Q(N)^\vee$ where $(-)^\vee$ is the Matlis-dual, see [5, Lemma 1.1]. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\left(H^{q_i}_Q(M_i/M_{i-1})^\vee\right)_{(k,*)} &\cong \left(H^{q_i}_Q(M)^\vee\right)_{(k,*)}\\ &\cong (L^\vee)_k \otimes_K H^{q_i}_Q(N)^\vee\\ &\cong \operatorname{Ext}^{n-q_i}_{K[y]}(N, K[y])^t,\end{aligned}$$

where $t = \dim_K(L^\vee)_k$. Since each M_i/M_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = q_i$, it follows from the above isomorphisms and Lemma 3.1 that $\operatorname{Ext}^{n-q_i}_{K[y]}(N, K[y])$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension q_i for $i = 1, \dots, r$. If $k \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$, then $L \otimes_K H^k_Q(N) \cong H^k_Q(M) = 0$. It follows that $H^k_Q(N) = 0$, and hence $\operatorname{Ext}^{n-k}_{K[y]}(N, K[y]) = 0$ for $k \notin \{q_1, \dots, q_r\}$. Therefore the result follows from [6, Theorem 1.4].

$(b) \Rightarrow (a)$: Let N be sequentially Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module with the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $0 = N_0 \subsetneq N_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq N_r = N$. Consider the filtration $0 = L \otimes_K N_0 \subsetneq L \otimes_K N_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq L \otimes_K N_r = L \otimes_K N$. We claim this filtration is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. First, we note that $L \otimes_K N_i \subsetneq L \otimes_K N_{i+1}$ for all i. Otherwise, we have $\dim N_i = \dim N_{i+1}$ by [10, Corollary 2.3], a contradiction. For all k and i we have the following isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}H^k_Q\big((L \otimes_K N_i)/(L \otimes_K N_{i-1})\big) &\cong H^k_Q\big(L \otimes_K (N_i/N_{i-1})\big)\\ &\cong L \otimes_K H^k_Q(N_i/N_{i-1}).\end{aligned}$$

We set $D_i = (L \otimes_K N_i)/(L \otimes_K N_{i-1})$ for all i. Thus we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, D_i) = \dim N_i/N_{i-1}$ for all i. This implies that $\operatorname{cd}\big(Q, D_{i-1}\big) < \operatorname{cd}\big(Q, D_i\big)$ for all i. Also each quotient D_i is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q because N_i/N_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay for all i. $\square$

If in Theorem 3.2, we let L be a sequentially Cohen–Macaulay $K[x]$-module and N a non-sequentially Cohen–Macaulay $K[y]$-module, then $L \otimes_K N$ is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and not sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P does not imply sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q in general.

In [9, Proposition 3.1] the relative Cohen–Macaulay property is characterized for Cohen–Macaulay modules as follows: if M is a finitely generated bigraded Cohen–Macaulay S-module, then M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P if and only if M is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus we may ask a similar question as follows:

Question 3.3. Let M be a finitely generated bigraded sequentially Cohen–Macaulay S-module. If M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P. Is M sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q?

We have a positive answer to this question in the following cases:

Proposition 3.4. *The following statements hold:*

(a) *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module with $|K| = \infty$. Suppose $\operatorname{cd}(P, M) = 0$. Then M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay if and only if M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.*

(b) *Let the notation be as in Proposition 3.2. Then, M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay S-module if and only if M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q.*

Proof. For the proof (a), we first let M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay and consider the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$. We show that $\mathcal{F}$ is Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. Since $\operatorname{cd}(P, M) = 0$, it follows from the exact sequences $0 \to M_{i-1} \to M_i \to M_i/M_{i-1} \to 0$ by using (4) that $\operatorname{cd}(P, M_i/M_{i-1}) = 0$ for all i. Hence by (3) we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \dim M_i/M_{i-1}$ for all i. This implies that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_{i+1}/M_i)$ for all i. On the other hand, since M_i/M_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay S-module for all i, it follows from (2) that $\operatorname{grade}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \dim M_i/M_{i-1} - \operatorname{cd}(P, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \dim M_i/M_{i-1}$. Thus M_i/M_{i-1} is relative Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Therefore, $\mathcal{F}$ is a relative Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q. Conversely, let $\mathcal{G}$: $0 = N_0 \subsetneq N_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq N_r = M$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration of M with respect to Q. We will show that $\mathcal{G}$ is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration for M. Since $\operatorname{cd}(P, M) = 0$, it follows that $\operatorname{cd}(P, N_i/N_{i-1}) = 0$ for all i. Thus $\operatorname{cd}(Q, N_i/N_{i-1}) = \dim N_i/N_{i-1}$ for all i, by (3). This implies that $\dim N_i/N_{i-1} < \dim N_{i+1}/N_i$ for all i. On the other hand, $\operatorname{depth} N_i/N_{i-1} \geq \operatorname{grade}(Q, N_i/N_{i-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, N_i/N_{i-1}) = \dim N_i/N_{i-1}$ for all i. Thus N_i/N_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay for all i. Therefore, $\mathcal{G}$ is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration for M.

For the proof (b), M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay S-module if and only if L and N are sequentially Cohen–Macaulay over $K[x]$ and $K[y]$, respectively, see [10, Theorem 2.11], and this is equivalent to saying that M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q by Proposition 3.2. □

Even for a finitely generated bigraded Cohen–Macaulay S-module of dimension 2 for which $\operatorname{grade}(P, M) = 0$ and $\operatorname{cd}(P, M) = 1$, we do not know whether M is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q.

Inspired by Question 3.3 we may ask the following question: Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module that is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q. Is M sequentially Cohen–Macaulay? The following example shows that the answer is negative. see [7, Example 1.2]. However, we have a positive answer to this question in Proposition 3.4.

Example 3.5. Let $S = K[x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2]$ be the standard bigraded ring, $I = (x_1, y_1) \cap (x_2, y_2)$ and set $R = S/I$. The ring R is unmixed but not Cohen–Macaulay. In fact, $\operatorname{depth} R = 1$ and $\dim R = 2$. One has that R is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q with $\operatorname{cd}(P, R) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = 1$. In particular, R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q. On the other hand, R is not sequentially Cohen–Macaulay. Because by Lemma 2.1, unmixed sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules are Cohen–Macaulay.

4. HYPERSURFACE RINGS WHICH ARE SEQUENTIALLY COHEN–MACAULAY WITH RESPECT TO Q

Let $f \in S$ be a bihomogeneous element of degree (a, b) and consider the hypersurface ring $R = S/fS$. We write

$$f = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha|=a \\ |\beta|=b}} c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha y^\beta \quad \textit{where} \quad c_{\alpha\beta} \in K.$$

Notice that R is a Cohen–Macaulay module of dimension $m + n - 1$. We have the following observations:

Lemma 4.1. *Consider the hypersurface ring R. Then the following statements hold:*

- (a) *If $a = 0$ and $b > 0$, then R is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P of* $\operatorname{cd}(P, R) = m$ *and Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q of* $\operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = n - 1$.
- (b) *If $a > 0$ and $b = 0$, then R is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P of* $\operatorname{cd}(P, R) = m - 1$ *and Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q of* $\operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = n$.
- (c) *If $a > 0$ and $b > 0$, then* $\operatorname{grade}(P, R) = m - 1$ *and* $\operatorname{cd}(P, R) = m$, *and* $\operatorname{grade}(Q, R) = n - 1$ *and* $\operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = n$.

Proof. In order to proof (a), if $a = 0$, then we may write $f = \sum_{|\beta|=b} c_\beta y^\beta$. Using Formula (1) we have $\operatorname{cd}(P, R) = \dim S/(Q + (f)) = m$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = \dim S/(P + (f)) = n - 1$. On the other hand, by using Formula (2), we have $\operatorname{grade}(P, R) = \dim R - \operatorname{cd}(Q, R) = m + n - 1 - (n - 1) = m$ and $\operatorname{grade}(Q, R) = \dim R - \operatorname{cd}(P, R) = m + n - 1 - m = n - 1$. Thus the conclusions follows. Parts (b) and (c) are proved in the same way using Formulas (1) and (2). □

Notice that if $a, b > 0$, then R is not Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus it is natural to ask whether R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. In the following, we classify all hypersurface rings that are sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. We need the following lemma for the proof of the main theorem

Lemma 4.2. *Let M be a finitely generated bigraded S-module that is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q with the Cohen–Macaulay filtration $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_r = M$. Then we have $\operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i) : \operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. In particular, $\operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1}) = \operatorname{Ass}(M_i)$ if and only if M_i is relatively unmixed with respect to Q.*

Proof. We first let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1})$. Since M_i/M_{i-1} is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows from [7, Corollary 1.11] that M_i/M_{i-1} is relatively unmixed with respect to Q and hence $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i/M_{i-1}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$. Thus we only need to show that $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i)$. As we always have $\operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1}) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(M_i) \cup \operatorname{Supp}(M_{i-1})$, it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \operatorname{Supp}(M_{i-1})$. Assume $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(M_{i-1})$. Then by using (6) we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) \leq \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_{i-1}) < \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$, a contradiction. Thus $\mathfrak{p} \notin \operatorname{Supp}(M_{i-1})$ and hence $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i)$. Now let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i)$ such that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/\mathfrak{p}) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, M_i)$. We will show that $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1})$. The exact sequence $0 \to M_{i-1} \to M_i \to M_i/M_{i-1}$ yields $\operatorname{Ass}(M_i) \subseteq \operatorname{Ass}(M_{i-1}) \cup \operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1})$. A similar argument as above by using (5) shows that $\mathfrak{p} \notin \operatorname{Ass}(M_{i-1})$ and hence $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}(M_i/M_{i-1})$. ☐

Proposition 4.3. *Let $f \in S$ be a bihomogeneous element of degree (a, b) such that $f = h_1h_2$ where $h_1 = \sum_{|\alpha|=a} c_\alpha x^\alpha$ with $c_\alpha \in K$ and $h_2 = \sum_{|\beta|=b} c_\beta y^\beta$ with $c_\beta \in K$. In other words, $\deg h_1 = (a, 0)$ and $\deg h_2 = (0, b)$. Consider the hypersurface ring $R = S/fS$. Then R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P and Q.*

Proof. We show that R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P. The argument for Q is similar. Consider the filtration $\mathcal{F}$: $0 = R_0 \subsetneq R_1 \subsetneq R_2 = R$ where $R_1 = h_2S/fS$. We claim that this filtration is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to P. Observe that $R_2/R_1 \cong S/h_2S$ is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P with $\operatorname{cd}(P, R_2/R_1) = m$, by Lemma 4.1(a) . Now consider the map $\varphi\colon S \longrightarrow h_2S/fS$ where $g \longmapsto gh_2 + fS$. We get the following isomorphism $S/h_1S \cong h_2S/fS \cong R_1/R_0$. Thus R_1/R_0 is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P with $\operatorname{cd}(P, R_1/R_0) = m - 1$, by Lemma 4.1(b). Therefore, $\mathcal{F}$ is the Cohen–Macaulay filtration of R with respect to P. ☐

Theorem 4.4. *Let $f \in S$ be a bihomogeneous element of degree (a, b) and $R = S/fS$ be the hypersurface ring. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) *R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q;*
(b) *$f = h_1h_2$ where $\deg h_1 = (a, 0)$ with $a \geq 0$ and $\deg h_2 = (0, b)$ with $b \geq 0$.*

Proof. (*a*) $\Rightarrow$ (*b*): Let $f = f_1f_2 \dots f_r$ be the unique factorization of f into bihomogeneous irreducible factors f_i with $\deg f_i = (a_i, b_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^r a_i = a$ and $\sum_{i=1}^r b_i = b$. Our aim is to show that for each f_i we have $\deg f_i = (a_i, 0)$ with $a_i \geq 0$ or $\deg f_i = (0, b_i)$ with $b_i \geq 0$. Assume this is not the case and so there exists $1 \leq s \leq r$ such that $\deg f_s = (a_s, b_s)$ with $a_s, b_s > 0$. We first show that in the factorization of $f = f_1 f_2 \dots f_r$ some f_i appear with $\deg f_i = (0, b_i)$. Otherwise, we may assume $\deg f_i = (a_i, 0)$ for $i = 1, \dots, s-1$ and $\deg f_i = (a_i, b_i)$ with $a_i, b_i > 0$ for $i = s, \dots, r$. Note that $(f) = (f_1) \cap (f_2) \cap \cdots \cap (f_r)$ and hence $\operatorname{Ass}(R) = \{(f_1), \dots, (f_r)\}$. For $i = 1, \dots, s$ by using (1) and Lemma 4.1, we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/(f_i)) = \dim S/(P + (f_i)) = n = \operatorname{cd}(Q, R)$. Thus R is relatively unmixed with respect to Q. As R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows that R is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q by Lemma 2.1, a contradiction. Thus we may assume that $\deg f_i = (a_i, 0)$ with $a_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, s-1$, $\deg f_i = (a_i, b_i)$ with $a_i, b_i > 0$ for $i = s, s+1, \dots, t$ and $\deg f_i = (0, b_i)$ with $b_i \geq 0$ for $i = t+1, \dots, r$, and $t < r$. Now let $0 = R_0 \subsetneq R_1 \subsetneq R_2 = R$ be the Cohen–Macaulay filtration with respect to Q where $R_1 = I/(f)$ for some bihomogeneous ideal I of S. Here we note that $r = 2$ by Corollary 1.8. By Lemma 4.2, $\operatorname{Ass}(S/I) = \operatorname{Ass}(R_2/R_1) = \{(f_1), \dots, (f_t)\}$. Thus $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_t$ with $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_i} = (f_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$ is a minimal primary decomposition of I. Notice that $I \subseteq \sqrt{I} = (g)$ where $g = \prod_{i=1}^t f_i$ with $\deg g = \left(\sum_{i=1}^t a_i, \sum_{i=1}^t b_i\right)$. If $I = (g)$, then as $\sum_{i=1}^t a_i > 0, \sum_{i=1}^t b_i > 0$ we have $\operatorname{grade}(Q, S/I) = n-1$ and $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/I) = n$, by Lemma 4.1. This contradicts with the fact that S/I is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q. Thus $(f) \subseteq I \subsetneq (g)$ and so $(g)/I$ is a non-zero submodule of S/I. Since S/I is Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, it follows from Lemma 1.11 that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, (g)/I) = \operatorname{cd}(Q, S/I) = n$. The map φ: $S \longrightarrow (g)/I$ where $h \longmapsto hg + I$ induces the following exact sequence $0 \to U \to S/(f_{t+1} \cdots f_r) \to (g)/I \to 0$, because $(f_{t+1} \cdots f_r)g = f \in I$. By Formula (4) we have $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/(f_{t+1} \cdots f_r)) = \max\{\operatorname{cd}(Q, U), \operatorname{cd}(Q, (g)/I)\} = n$. As $\deg f_i = (0, b_i)$ for $i = t+1, \dots, r$, by Lemma 4.1 it follows that $\operatorname{cd}(Q, S/(f_{t+1} \cdots f_r)) = n-1$, a contradiction. $(b) \Rightarrow (a)$: follows from Proposition 4.3. ☐

Corollary 4.5. *Let R be the hypersurface ring. Then R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q if and only if R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to P.*

In view of Corollary 2.8 we have the following

Corollary 4.6. *Let R be the hypersurface ring. If R is sequentially Cohen–Macaulay with respect to Q, then $\operatorname{reg} H^i_Q(R)_j$ is bounded for $i = n-1, n$. In particular, $\operatorname{reg} H^i_Q(S/gS)_j$ is bounded for $i = n-1, n$ where (g) is a principal monomial ideal in S.*

Remark 4.7. In [8] we have shown that the bound for the regularity of graded components of the local cohomology of the hypersurface ring under some extra assumptions is linear.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Jürgen Herzog for his helpful comments.

REFERENCES

[1] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, "Cohen–Macaulay rings" (Revised edition), Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **39**, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[2] M. Chardin, J. P. Jouanolou, A. Rahimi, The eventual stability of depth, associated primes and cohomology of a graded module, J. Comm. Alg, to appear (arXiv:1203.4342).

[3] N. T. Cuong, L. T. Nhan, Pseudo Cohen–Macaulay and pseudo generalized Cohen–Macaulay modules, J. Algebra **267** (2003), 156–177.

[4] S. Faridi, Monomial ideals via square-free monomial ideals, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, **244**(2005), 85–114.

[5] J. Herzog, A. Rahimi, Local duality for bigraded modules, Ill. J. Math, **51**(2007), 137–150.

[6] J. Herzog, E. Sbarra, Sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules and local cohomology. In: Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math., vol. 16. pp. 327-340.

[7] M. Jahangiri, A. Rahimi, Relative Cohen–Macaulayness and relative unmixedness of bigraded modules, J. Comm. Alg, to appear (arXiv: 1105.3091).

[8] A. Rahimi, On the regularity of local cohomology of bigraded algebras, J. Algebra **302**(2006), 313-339.

[9] A. Rahimi, Relative Cohen-Macaulayness of bigraded modules, J. Algebra **323**(2010), 1745-1757.

[10] H. Sabzrou, M. Tousi and S. Yassemi, Simplicial join via tensor product, Manuscripta math **126** (2008), 255-272.

[11] P. Schenzel, On the dimension filtration and Cohen-Macaulay filtered modules, in Proc. of the Ferrara meeting in honour of Mario Fiorentini, University of Antwerp Wilrijk, Belgium (1998), Dekker, New York, 1999, pp. 245-264. MR 1702109 (2000i:13012).

[12] R. P. Stanley, Combinatorics and commutative algebra, Second edition, Birkhäuser Boston-Basel-Berlin, 1996.

[13] M. Tousi, S. Yassemi, Sequentially Cohen–Macaulay modules under base change, Comm. Algebra, **33**(2005), 3977-3987.

Ahad Rahimi, Department of Mathematics, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran. School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P. O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail address: `ahad.rahimi@razi.ac.ir`